

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/532,528	REUTELER ET AL.
	Examiner Christopher R. Harmon	Art Unit 3721

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Christopher R. Harmon. (3) _____

(2) Andrew Doriso. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 13 May 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted. d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 4

Identification of prior art discussed: SCHNEIDER ET AL.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See above

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Claims were discussed involving different inventions.
Prior art concerned with claim scope.
Some amendments made to clarify and/or the
Inventor defining ownership of the invention in terms of the
prior conveyances between them and teams of the
party of the bank.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action

Examiner's signature, if required